APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,921	01/03/2001	Jean Francois Le Pennec	FR919990109US1	1735

7590 06/16/2004	**EXAMINER**	
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON	LEE, ANDREW CHUNG CHEUN	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW	**ART UNIT**	**PAPER NUMBER**
P.O. BOX 969	2664	
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0969		

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _03 January 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under _Ex parte Quayle_, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _6_ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-3,5 and 9-11_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _4, 6-8, 12-16_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1.   The drawing Fig. 1 is objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)
because it does not include the following reference sign(s) binary "1" between nodes A
and C, and binary "0" between nodes A and B. A proposed drawing correction or
corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of
the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2.   The drawing of FiG.1 is objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)
because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned and described in the
description: Fig. 1 shows the tree 100 indicating to the right of branch using binary "1"
element and to the left of branch using binary "0" element. The specification (Pages 7 to
8) does not disclose clearly how element RT5 01010 is included and how at node G the
five binary bits (10111, 10101, 10011) be concluded. A proposed drawing correction,
corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in
the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the
application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3.   The drawing of Fig. 5 is objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)
because they include the following reference sign(s) or legends not indicated and
described in the description: MODE, NBR OF COMP, NBR OF NEXTADD, B1 IX, B2
IX, B3 IX, B4 IX, for INSTRUCTION FIELD; FIELD IF OK, COMPARSION PATTERN for
COMPARISION FIELD 1....n. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or
amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are

required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The

objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract exceeds more

than 150 words in length and the title of invention is not required in the abstract page.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

A brief abstract of the technical disclosure in the specification must commence
on a separate sheet, preferably following the claims, under the heading "Abstract" or
"Abstract of the Disclosure." The abstract in an application filed under 35U.S.C. 111
may not exceed 150 words in length. The purpose of the abstract is to enable the
United States Patent and Trademark Office and the public generally to determine
quickly from a cursory inspection the nature and gist of the technical disclosure. The
abstract will not be used for interpreting the scope of the claims

5.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- Page 1, line 11, The Office suggests "FOR" should change to "for".

- Fig 4, indicating line for element 40 (NEXT ADD) is missing; the location of

  Instruction Address (InsAD) for bank data bus 46 is misplaced. Applicant

  should clarify these issues.

- Fig. 5, Applicant should clarify the format of NEXT ADD FIELD 1 ....n.

- Page 9, lines 15, 19 and 32, The Office suggests "Banks 20 and 22"

  should be changed to "Bank A 20 and Bank B 22" so as in consistent with

  the Fig 2

- Page 18, Claim 8, there is a typo in Claim 8, "The system of Claim 8". " 8"

  should be clarified by the applicant.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1 to 3, 5,9 to 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Gobuyan (US 5,917,824) in view of Cross (US 6,026,473).

Regarding Claims 1 to 3, 5, 9 to 11, Gobuyan discloses the limitations of a

packet including a source address bit pattern and a destination address bit pattern that

are each processed by a task processor in accordance with a data tree,((Abstract, lines

5-12). Data tree including a plurality of nodes linked by branches wherein an instruction

that is associated with each node within the data tree be utilized for determining which

branch to be taken in accordance with the source address bit pattern or the destination

address bit pattern (col 1, lines 56-59). He discloses the system comprising: a first bank

of registers for loading an instruction to be executed by the task processor at each node

of said data tree in accordance with the source address bit pattern; a second bank of

registers for loading an instruction to be executed by the task processor at each node of

the data tree in accordance with the destination address bit pattern (Fig 3, Fig 5, col 2,

lines 32-36); He also discloses the limitations of memory including instructions to be

executed by task process as in Claim 5 (col 7, lines 34-44). But Gobuyan does not

disclose a task scheduler for enabling the first bank of registers to transfer an instruction

loaded therein for processing by the task processor only during even time cycles and for

enabling the second bank of registers to transfer an instruction loaded therein for

processing by said task processor only during odd time cycles. Cross teaches a task scheduler for enabling said first bank of registers to transfer an instruction loaded therein for processing by the task processor only during even time cycles and for enabling said second bank of registers to transfer an instruction loaded therein for processing by said task processor only during odd time cycles (col 2, lines 38-46). Therefore It would have been obvious to modify Gobuyan the task scheduler for enabling the first bank of registers to transfer an instruction loaded therein for processing by the task processor only during even time cycles and for enabling the second bank of registers to transfer an instruction loaded therein for processing by said task processor only during odd time cycles as taught by Cross in order to allow sufficient setup and hold time to store the data values of source and destination addresses in the memory elements of first and second memory banks without having to reduce the input data rate.

Allowable Subject Matter

8.   Claims 4, 6 to 8 and 12 to 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9.   Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon the correction of the typo in the claim, but would be allowable if rewritten or corrected.

Conclusion

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Andrew C Lee whose telephone number is (703) 305-

8086. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30am -

5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on (703) 305-4366. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ACL   03 June 2004

Ajit Patel
Primary Examiner